

FEB 22 2000

EIS002251

- 1 MR. CHARFF: John Charff affiliated with Shundahai Network. [I appreciate the opportunity to ask a question earlier. I feel like it wasn't thoroughly answered, but the answer I did get that the science errs to the side of conservatism tells me that it is not science being used to study Yucca Mountain, and that it is influenced by the scientists. Because if it wasn't, the answer should have been that it is science. There's no possibility of either erring conservatively or otherwise.]
- 2 Anyway, first [I would like to say that I would like answers to the question of whether the DOE, the Department of Defense, had lied about past spills and their effects. We heard earlier in the last session from two scientists in the industry saying that no one has died, while we know in Tioga, Japan, recently several people died.] And so we have to look seriously at statistics and the truth and not be swayed by the industry because we know which side the industry is on.
- 3 [A one-in-ten-million chance of an accident is too many for me to even fathom how somebody can come up with these kind of numbers. It is unbelievable. Okay, what happens if the transportation is interrupted? If you have a bridge that fails, and you have to reroute it? I see nothing about the added effects from extended length of transportation time.]
- 4 [I see no economic analysis for the costs to citizens of the no-action versus having the Yucca Mountain dump.]
- 5 [The EIS is national in scope, but I think we have a world-wide problem here. We all know that radiation is spread throughout the world from numerous events from the Nevada Test Site. And I think that the DOE needs to consider the whole world in its comments on this, because the whole world and all animal life and plant life are being affected now as we see higher and higher rates of cancer and the declining species in this world.]
- 6 [I thought that it was laughable that the DOE sent out 3,000 copies of the DEIS, and yet the major antinuclear groups couldn't receive them for weeks and weeks. I imagine they were probably sent to industry. But that would hardly cover the people even in the industry, I would assume.] They have said that today, it would be 2010 before they begin shipments. In St. Louis, they said, quote, 2004 possibly. They said today that they would have four years of training before shipment. And so to me, that doesn't jibe if they are saying that it could start in 2004, and I know for a fact that there's been evidence in this room and Las Vegas that there's no training going on.
- 8 [Okay. There is no certification of the cask. How can we make a reasonable comment about something that we have had nothing to even look at? It's something like the emperor wears no clothes.]
- 9 [Another thing is the cumulative impact section assumes a ten-year extension of reactor life. I always was told that if you assume something, you make an ass out of me and you, which is, I think, basically the basis of the DOE documents.]

FACILITATOR HOLMES: Four-minute mark.

- 10... MR. CHARFF: Okay. [We have 27 active volcanos that you can see from the top of Yucca Mountain. You may not think they are active, but the Shoshone people, since the 1900's have seen two volcanos erupt there. They have a lot of historic knowledge -- and we haven't been around long enough. We know now there's 33 earthquake faults, and they have yet to really be consulted with the history around Yucca Mountain and the fact that there have been these recent eruptions -- there's hot springs in the area, which we know the mineral waters migrate; they aren't stable like cool water springs might tend to be.]

10 cont. The people that drilled the Yucca Mountain exploratory hole, quote, said that it is the worst possible material that you could go in. If you go down the hole, you will see areas where the rock is fractured not much bigger than a two-inch gravel, being held back by iron I-beams. And it's like how are you expecting with all of this heat from radioactive waste to keep it from affecting the iron and allowing for a cave-in?

11 So anyway with the DOE record of having admitted now that there are past cancers associated with the nuclear industry and with the Nevada Test Site, and they are willing to pay for some of the health effects, I think that to say that we have these few amounts of incidences and increasing of cancer is just totally ignorance. And I call upon the Department of Energy to withdraw the Yucca Mountain plan and to do the no-action plan and to take the time to go back and look at suitable ways that won't pollute the world.

FACILITATOR HOLMES: Thank you. Okay. Reinard Knutsen, to be followed by Thomas Lorenz.